

**REMARKS**

This Amendment is submitted in response to an outstanding Office Action dated March 17, the shortened statutory period for response set to expire on June 17, 2004.

I. Status of the Claims

Please amend claims 22, 25, 29, and 31 as indicated above. Claims 22-26 and 29-31 are now pending in the application. Claims 22 and 25 are independent claims.

Applicant acknowledges the Examiner's citation of statutory authority as a basis for claim rejections.

II. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 22-23 and 25-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carlsson in view of Ichikawa. In addition, the Examiner rejected claims 24 and 29-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carlsson in view of Ichikawa and Sanders, III.

With regard to claim 22, the Examiner states that Carlsson teaches all of the features except requesting the first base station to release the first identification information stored in memory. Further, the Examiner states that Ichikawa teaches a base station requesting another base station erase first identification information stored in memory, and that it would have been obvious to make the device adapt to include requesting the first base station to release the first identification information stored in memory because this would allow for the efficient operation of wireless radio devices with multiple base stations. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection of claim 22.

Claim 22 as amended recites: a second base station comprising allocation means and request means. The allocation means is for allocating second identification information to

the terminal for specifying the terminal. The request means is for requesting the first base station to release the first identification information that is allocated by the first base station and stored in the memory means of the first base station.

Neither Carlsson nor Ichikawa discloses or suggests a request means of a second base station for requesting a first base station to release the first identification information allocated by the first base station.

In Carlsson, the “mobile services switching center orders the first base station BS1 to release the first digital traffic channel (DTC1).” (Carlsson at col. 6, lines 13-15). Applicant submits that the mobile services switching center of Carlsson is not a second base station, and there is nothing in Carlsson that teaches or suggests a second base station with request means for requesting the first base station to release the first identification information stored in the memory means of the first base station. Applicant further submits that by describing a release by the mobile services switching center, Carlsson teaches away from the invention recited in claim 22.

In Ichikawa, the identification data setting circuits 10A to 10N store individual IDs allocated to respective radio telephone sets into memories 11A to 11N of, respectively, base stations 7A to 7N, and erases the individual IDs “sent from other base stations” if the individual IDs have been stored in the respective memories. (Col. 3, lines 54-66). Thus if an individual ID that is the same as an individual ID stored in a base station is stored in another base station, the individual ID stored in the other base station is erased.

Therefore, Applicant submits that contrary to what the Examiner stated, the base stations in Ichikawa do not request another base station to erase identification information stored in the latter, for the base stations direct themselves, rather than request another base station, to

erase the identification information. (Col. 3, lines 61-66 and col. 4, lines 35-42). Moreover, Ichikawa does not teach a second base station that requests the first base station to erase identification information that has been allocated by the first base station.

By contrast, the claimed invention recites a first base station that allocates first identification information for a terminal, and a second base station that allocates second identification information for a terminal and requests the first base station to release the first identification information allocated by the first base station. Therefore, claim 22 is not obvious over Carlsson and Ichikawa.

With regard to claim 25, the Examiner states that Carlsson teaches all of the features except requesting the first base station to release the first identification information stored in memory. Further, the Examiner states that Ichikawa teaches a base station requesting another base station erase first identification information stored in memory, and that it would have been obvious to make the device adapt to include requesting the first base station to release the first identification information stored in memory because this would allow for the efficient operation of wireless radio devices with multiple base stations. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection of claim 25.

Claim 25 as amended recites: allocating first identification information by a first base station to the terminal for specifying the terminal, storing the first identification information in the first base station, allocating second identification information from a second base station to the terminal, and requesting from the second base station the first base station to release the first identification information allocated by the first base station.

Neither Carlsson nor Ichikawa discloses or suggests requesting from the second base station to the first base station to release the first identification information allocated by the

first base station.

As discussed above, in Carlsson, the “mobile services switching center orders the first base station BS1 to release the first digital traffic channel (DTC1).” (Carlsson at col. 6, lines 13-15). The mobile services switching center of Carlsson is not a second base station, and there is nothing in Carlsson that teaches or suggests requesting from the second base station the first base station to release the first identification information. Applicant further submits that by describing a release by the mobile services switching center, Carlsson teaches away from the invention recited in claim 25.

Also as discussed above, in Ichikawa, the identification data setting circuits 10A to 10N store individual IDs allocated to respective radio telephone sets into memories 11A to 11N of, respectively, base stations 7A to 7N, and erases the individual IDs “sent from other base stations” if the individual IDs have been stored in the respective memories. (Col. 3, lines 54-66). Thus if an individual ID that is the same as an individual ID stored in a base station is stored in another base station, the individual ID stored in the other base station is erased.

Therefore, Applicants submit that contrary to what the Examiner stated, the base stations in Ichikawa do not request another base station to erase identification information stored in the latter, for the base stations direct themselves, rather than request another base station, to erase the identification information. (Col. 3, lines 61-66 and col. 4, lines 35-42). Moreover, Ichikawa does not teach a second base station that requests the first base station to erase identification information that has been allocated by the first base station.

By contrast, the claimed invention recites the steps of allocating first identification information by a first base station for a terminal, and allocating second identification information by a second base station for a terminal, and requesting from the second base station the first base

station-to-release the first identification information allocated by the first base station. Therefore, claim 25 is not obvious over Carlsson and Ichikawa.

For at least these reasons, Applicant submits that neither Carlsson nor Ichikawa individually or in combination discloses all of the elements of independent claims 22 and 25 and the claims that depend therefrom.

III. Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims of this application are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration of the rejection and allowance is requested. If a conference would assist in placing this application in better condition for allowance, the undersigned would appreciate a telephone call at the number indicated.

Respectfully submitted,  
Milbank, Tweed, Hadley & McCloy LLP



Chris L. Holm  
Reg. No.: 39,227

June 14, 2004

Milbank Tweed Hadley & McCloy LLP  
1 Chase Manhattan Plaza  
New York, NY 10005  
(212) 530-5000 / (212) 530-5219 (facsimile)

NY2 : #4595570